DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 063 247 24 SP 005 612

AUTHOR	Haberman, Martin
TITLE	Guidelines for the Selection of Students in Programs of Teacher Education.
INSTITUTION	Association of Teacher Educators, Washington, D.C.
SPONS AGENCY	ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, Washington, D.C.
BUREAU NO	BR-8-0490
PUB DATE	May 72
CONTRACT	OEC-0-8-080490-3706(010)
NOTE	33p.; Research Bulletin 11
AVAILABLE FROM	ATE, 1201 16th St. N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036 (Stock no. 868-24468; $1.50 single copy, quantity discount)
EDRS PRICE	MF-$0.65 HC-$3.29
DESCRIPTORS	*Admission Criteria; *Educational Supply; *Open Enrollment; Teacher Background; *Teacher Education; *Teacher Selection

ABSTRACT

The author reviews research evidence he considers pertinent to the selection of teacher education students and synthesizes the evidence into 11 criteria for selection. The areas of childhood development, adult learning, college influence on students, college student characteristics, and present selection practices are all explored. In particular, Haberman discusses the durability of values learned in childhood, the outstanding cognitive and affective characteristics of adults in their twenties and thirties (usually considered too old to enter the profession), the relatively weak influence of the college environment on vocationally oriented students, the cultural pluralism of the new student population, and the use of grades as the currently most popular selection criteria for admission into teacher education programs. These observations lead Haberman to the formation of selection criteria which emphasize a candidate's values and capacity for adult growth and which define student characteristics in terms of program goals rather than in terms of typically acceptable student characteristics. (LP)

ED 063247

ATE Research Bulletin 11

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH,
EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION
THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

GUIDELINES FOR THE SELECTION OF STUDENTS INTO PROGRAMS OF TEACHER EDUCATION

MARTIN HABERMAN
Professor, Curriculum and Instruction
University of Wisconsin-Milwaukee

Published by
Association of Teacher Educators
and
ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education

May 1972

SP 005 612

SP 005 612

ED 063571

This publication was prepared pursuant to a contract with the U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education, Contract number OEC-0-8-080490-3706-(010). Contractors undertaking such projects under government sponsorship are encouraged to express their judgment in professional and technical matters. Points of view or opinions do not, therefore, necessarily represent official Office of Education position or policy.

ASSOCIATION OF TEACHER EDUCATORS
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Melvin C. Buller, Executive Secretary

* * *

ERIC CLEARINGHOUSE ON TEACHER EDUCATION
Number One Dupont Circle, N.W.
Washington, D.C. 20036

Joel L. Burdin, Director

Library of Congress Catalog Card Number 72-81780

TO PURCHASE: Single Copy, $1.50 (stock number 868-24468). Discounts on quantity orders: 5 or more copies of a title, 10 percent. All orders must be prepaid except those on official purchase order forms. Shipping and handling charges will be added to billed orders. Make check or money order payable to the ATE. Order from Association of Teacher Educators, 1201 - 16th Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036.

6/72-3000

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Foreword iv

Abstract v

Introduction vi

Section 1. Childhood Learning 1

2. Adult Learning 3

3. College Influence. 6

Characteristics of Vocationally Oriented College Students

The New Students of the 1970's and 1980's

4. Survey of Selection Criteria 14

Table 1
Table 2
Table 3

5. Guidelines for Selection 17

Bibliography 21

ATE Publications Order Blank 24

About ERIC 26

FOREWORD

The Association of Teacher Educators and the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education are pleased to present Martin Haberman's paper *Guidelines for the Selection of Students into Programs of Teacher Education* for your thoughtful consideration.

A little over a year ago the Ohio ATE Unit approached Dr. Haberman with the request that he present part of the keynote address at the 1972 conference. He agreed. As his topic he suggested some research he had been doing on the selection of teacher education students. To add to his research, ATE ran a questionnaire on selection criteria. The tabulations from this questionnaire form the basis for this paper.

We are pleased that Dr. Haberman has permitted us to publish the paper he presented at the 1972 ATE Conference, February 23, at the Conrad Hilton Hotel, Chicago, Illinois. The views expressed by Dr. Haberman are personal ones and do not necessarily reflect those of ATE, the Clearinghouse, or its sponsors.

This is a joint publication of ATE and of the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, cosponsored by ATE; the Council on Instruction and Professional Development, National Education Association; and the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education.

--Melvin C. Buller, Executive Secretary
Association of Teacher Educators

--Joel L. Burdin, Director
ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education

May 1972

Technical editing and production supervision by Linda B. Moore, ATE staff, and Elizabeth B. Hamilton, free-lance editor.

ABSTRACT

The author reviews research evidence he considers pertinent to the selection of teacher education students and synthesizes the evidence into 11 criteria for selection. The areas of childhood development, adult learning, college influence on students, college student characteristics, and present selection practices are all explored. In particular, Haberman discusses the durability of values learned in childhood, the outstanding cognitive and affective characteristics of adults in their twenties and thirties (usually considered too old to enter the profession), the relatively weak influence of the college environment on vocationally oriented students, the cultural pluralism of the new student population, and the use of grades as the currently most popular selection criteria for admission into teacher education programs. These observations lead Haberman to the formation of selection criteria which emphasize a candidate's values and capacity for adult growth and which define student characteristics in terms of program goals rather than in terms of typically acceptable student characteristics. (LP)

ERIC DESCRIPTORS

To expand a bibliography using ERIC, descriptors or search terms are used. To use a descriptor: (1) Look up the descriptor in the SUBJECT INDEX of monthly, semi-annual, or annual issue of Research in Education (RIE). (2) Beneath the descriptors you will find title(s) of documents. Decide which titles(s) you wish to pursue. (3) Note the "ED" number beside the title. (4) Look up the "ED" number in the "DOCUMENT RESUME SECTION" of the appropriate issue of RIE. With the number you will find a summary of the document and often the document's cost in microfiche and/or hardcopy. (5) Repeat the above procedure, if desired, for other issue of RIE and for other descriptors. (6) For information about how to order ERIC documents, turn to the back pages of RIE. (7) Indexes and annotations of journal articles can be found in Current Index to Journals in Education by following the same procedure. Periodical articles cannot be secured through ERIC.

TOPIC: *"Guidelines for the Selection of Students into Programs of Teacher Education."*

DESCRIPTORS TO USE IN CONTINUING SEARCH OF RIE AND CIJE:

*Admission Criteria
Adult Learning
Child Development
College Environment
*Education Majors
Student Characteristics

---

*Asterisks indicate major descriptors.

INTRODUCTION

This analysis does not deal with the issue, "Is there a shortage of teaching positions, or, is there a lack of public commitment to education?" Those who define the issue as oversupply in teacher production can make an impressive statistical argument that now and in the foreseeable future there will be more beginning teachers than the public schools will be able to support. Those who argue on the basis of what "should be" emphasize the humane concerns of extending services to younger children and exceptional children, and the quality concern of redefining teacher load to significantly less than 30:1 elementary and 150:1 secondary.

These positions facilitate much rhetoric. The obvious truth to remember when considering the alternatives is that there is no detached, scientific viewpoint. Each position makes normative assumptions which would narrowly limit either the responsibilities of public education or the nature of higher education.

Those who claim to be realists point to the large existing pool of unemployed experienced teachers, to the increasing number of beginners being produced by universities, and to decreasing birth rates. But this brand of realism, in effect, lends support to those who seek to preserve present forms of schooling with no extension of educational services to the very young or to the exceptional, and with no change in present concepts of staffing. In truth, the "realistic" position encourages public schools to remain as they are and places full responsibility on schools of education *and their clientele* to make all the necessary adjustments, i.e., cutbacks.

On the other hand, some of those who make the heartrending "should be" argument seek to preserve higher education and schools of education on their course of unbridled expansion, unaccountable to no one, least of all to the taxpayers who support the large public institutions of higher education. All the changes "required" are adjustments, i.e., expansions that should be made in public schools. It certainly sounds convincing to describe the needs of minorities, two-year olds, the retarded, and all pupils who might benefit from smaller classes and differentiated staffing. But is it reasonable for those in teacher education to expect all other institutions to change while schools of education happily inflate at whatever rate their faculties deem appropriate?

My position is that both contentions--that there is a shortage of positions or of teachers--are simplistic. I assume that the Association of Teacher Educators is interested in and assiduously working toward, the objective of selecting the very best people into teacher education regardless of present trends. I assume that threats by state legislatures to cut back or even close schools of education, that a shrinking job market for preservice graduates, and that lower morale among college students anticipating unemployment are not the primary reasons we seek better methods for selecting students into teacher education programs. I assume that we will all do more than complain about lower schools and that we

will actively engage in efforts to broaden public support for early childhood education and to improve present staffing patterns. Finally, I assume that as teacher educators we are always open to changing ourselves and that we are studying selection because we sincerely believe in raising the quality of our candidates and in improving our own programs. We do not seek to simply conduct business as usual while we accuse lower schools and the public of traditionalism.

Regardless of the variance in perceptions concerning the future need for teachers, colleges and universities will continue to select large numbers of students into their teacher education programs and at least 100,000 of these graduates will annually begin to teach children and youth (13). In order to develop guidelines for improving this process of selecting students into teacher education programs, this paper will synthesize relevant evidence regarding human development, adult learning, college influence, college student characteristics and present selection practices. The guidelines which conclude the paper are my best judgments based on the evidence I have selected and is in no way offered as a summary of the various bodies of research literature that have been tapped.

Section 1

CHILDHOOD LEARNING

Lest it seem strange to begin with a statement of childhood learning in a research review developing selection criteria for teacher education programs, permit me to report the datum that more than one-half (56.7 percent) of northern white college seniors and almost two-thirds (64.2 percent) of northern Negro college seniors state that they planned to become elementary school teachers when they were in the elementary grades (6:366). If these large percentages are not sufficiently startling, only a moment's reflection is necessary to remind ourselves that 100 percent of our teacher graduates have experienced their primary socialization into teacher-pupil roles as very young children in elementary and preschool situations. The implications of this fact are seldom pursued in detail. To develop any sound guidelines for selection, however, these early processes must be duly considered.

Most of what we know, or are predisposed to learn, is the result of the interpersonal relationships by which we were socialized as children. Those who most influenced this socialization process did so through their power, affect, frequency of contact and their control over our rewards and punishments. Significant others shape our expectations for self and others and are of high salience throughout our lives; they influence the development of character, even as new significant others are added and older ones displaced. The result is the emergence of a series of self-other systems in which children are clearly oriented to the role of prescriptions and role evaluations staked out for them by the significant others in their early environment. Personality can largely be described and understood as the sum and synthesis of these learned relationships.

Psychological constructs explain how children learn behavior appropriate to their positions in groups by interacting with adults who hold normative beliefs about their roles and who reward or punish them for correct or incorrect actions. Sociological constructs demonstrate that a major component of socialization involves anticipating others' responses to one's own behavior and appraising that behavior as good or bad. Children could not function without this ability to learn and predict expected behaviors. The anticipation of others becomes symbolized, and children rehearse these expectations. Stated as a simple result--socialization is not only a set of learnings which can lead compliant, successful youngsters who already know that they want to become teachers to practice school in the garage, but the process by which those who are resentful for failing are taught to play school with the very same degree of accuracy.

Margaret Mead views selfhood as a process by which a person uses language to see himself as others view him (2). In effect, he knows himself only through roles such as youngest child or good pupil. Social scientists have now accepted the proposition that after an interaction between two persons has been repeated frequently, it becomes possible to carry out covertly the entire pattern *alone* (3:10). In effect, it is no longer even necessary to play school and to fully know the role of the teacher.

Parsons contends that children emphasize different learning processes as they mature, moving from conditioned response, to modeling behavior, to trial and error. The interesting feature is that Parsons claims the trial

and error stage is merely a resurrection of the earlier conditioned responses and not problem solving (27:422). If this grand contention is true, it lends credence to the baffling behavior we observe in student teachers and beginning teachers who demand that children sit quietly and fold their hands and then cannot recall any place in their teacher education where they saw, heard or read about such instructional behavior.

Those who argue for the potency and durability of early childhood learning support their contentions on the frequency of learning situations, their primacy in the career of the organism, and the intensity of the rewards or punishments administered. Changing these learnings is difficult because they are achieved under conditions of reinforcement. Some psychiatrists also characterize this early learning as a period when the bulk of unconscious materials is accumulated which will influence the modes of defense that continue through life. In summarizing this research, Bernice Neugarten states that the evidence shows "continuity of personality" but a great degree of the variance in later personality remains unaccounted for. She concludes that "the nature of changes in adulthood may be obscure, but the conviction is a reasonable one that changes do occur" (23:55). The issue for teacher education is clear: What are the reasonable changes which can be expected in adulthood, given the fundamental continuance of personality?

In his monograph on "Socialization Through the Life Cycle" Brim suggests five characteristics which distinguish adult socialization from childhood learning (2:27-32). First, adult socialization deals with overt behaviors not shifts in basic values. Second, these behaviors, including affective ones, are more likely to be new syntheses of old material rather than the acquisition of new material. Third, maturity inevitably transforms ideals into more realistic expectations. Fourth, there is an increasing ability to deal with conflict situations and complex demands simultaneously. Fifth, there is an ever narrowing search for specificity in role.

Each of these dimensions is conceived as a natural condition for describing adult potential for learning. My suggestion is that these conditions can serve not only as guidelines for structuring the content of our programs but also for the selection process. A period of direct experience with youngsters, simulated activities, and an intensive interview might well be a process for assessing the readiness of candidates for these five kinds of more mature learning.

Individual differences among college youth must be recognized--even within their narrow age-range. On what basis can we continue to behave as if freshman or junior status is a significant selection criterion and ignore the readiness of individual students to pursue the five kinds of learning which makes adult change at all likely?

The research and social science literature referred to thus far has emphasized the nature argument; the concepts of significant others, group functioning, and socialization into roles have been suggested as the potential for learning. There is another whole source of input which emphasizes inherent capacities. What are the implications of major findings regarding basic abilities for adult learning and the selection of adults into teacher education programs?

Section 2

ADULT LEARNING

Knowledge of growth potentials as well as the natural decline of selected abilities among adult learners should be fundamental information for teacher educators. University faculties and school cooperating personnel range in age from twenty to seventy. Since their capacities and handicaps influence future teachers, it is indeed strange that so little appears in teacher education literature regarding adult learning.

For purposes of this analysis on the process of selection into programs, adult learning is important because of the relatively open success for people of all ages to enter teaching or to retrain their specializations, particularly during periods of teacher shortage. Is there an ideal age for most people to learn how to teach? What are the learning potentials and intellectual characteristics of younger and older persons preparing to teach? What guidelines are suggested for selection practices by what we can distill from the research literature about adult learning?

Intelligence

In a general way, there is a classic pattern of aging decline. Verbal abilities and stored information show relatively little, if any, deficit, but psychomotor skills involving speed and perceptual-integrative abilities decline much more appreciably.

The role of age is so dominant in the measure of intellectual abilities that the actual process for computing the I.Q. score has a factor of age built into it. The scaled scores are arbitrarily set so that up to age thirty-four an individual who scores 110 has his score converted down to 100 while an individual who is seventy-five automatically gets 32 points added to his score in order to reach the "normal" 100 (32).

A person's decline in capacity is really significant only when related to his needs. A loss in memory, in the ability to keep many things in mind at one time and to do things speedily may be less important to the businessman than to his secretary. This makes the critical question one of role: Is teaching more like the general functioning of the businessman or more like the specific tasks of his secretary?

Vocabulary

Here, as with some of the other abilities, proficient people show little or no decrease with age. It seems that with initially more proficient people, information that was acquired early in life and the verbal skills that accompany this information tend to be maintained and even improved at least into the fifties (1:39).

Numerous studies have indicated that if women who are in their twenties, forties and sixties are compared, vocabulary scores increase with age while the ability to abstract tends to decrease (10:395-8). The important point about these studies is that they were of women who were

above average in education. These data are supported by Coleman who found that among whites or blacks, north or south, more experienced teachers scored higher than less experienced teachers, who in turn scored higher than college seniors on verbal competence (6:345).

Thinking

Whether thinking is defined as the classification of ideas into categories or as logical inference and generalization, older people tend to show little variety in their responses. They stick with principles even when the principles are not correct, and they produce fewer abstract concepts than younger people. Their conceptualizations tend to be functional and concrete rather than generalized or abstract. Older people seem unable to inhibit irrelevant intrusions or to stop their own conceptualization patterns when they are no longer rewarding. Older people perform less well on those factors associated with thinking (11).

Problem Solving

Closely related to thinking are the patterns followed in the process of solving problems. When subjects aged twenty through fifty are compared, younger people make less errors and persist longer (33). Generally, older persons solve problems less well, seek the same information redundantly, use less thoughtful processes, and are more haphazard (16). Solving problems depends on an ability to see goals and apparently this declines with age.

Creativity

Lehman has established, to most experts' satisfaction, that the period of thirty to thirty-nine is the most creative period and that the rate of decline of this ability is very gradual. Interestingly and less familiar is his finding that the rate of production of worthy but less creative works frequently *increases* beyond these peak years (19). As is well known on an experiential level, we tend to immediately impose administrative tasks on our most productive people, and this may partially account for their curtailed production.

The research literature is of small comfort to those of us who are elderly or who are planning to grow at least "somewhat older." It must be remembered, however, that what is considered old in this review is above fifty years of age. In the business of selecting future teachers we regard people in their twenties and thirties as "old." The research evidence indicates no decline of any sort for these "old" people--in fact, areas such as creative production are merely beginning. In truth, the research literature would in no way negate *requiring* an age of twenty-eight or thirty as a criterion of selection into teacher education programs.

While there is no "hard" evidence to support the idea of shifting the focus of teacher education from college youth to young adulthood, there is much theory, logic and experiential evidence for doing so. If learning is greatest when it can be related to experience, e.g., child-rearing or living in a particular neighborhood, then young adults have

a decade of experiences to support their learnings, to see greater relevance, and to integrate them. If more education and greater motivation are as potent factors as learning experts claim, then these are often weighted in favor of young adults over undergraduate youth. Finally, much testimonial evidence of those who have directed fifth-year programs, intern programs and retraining programs for young adults is overwhelming on the greater learning power of adults when compared to college youth. This contention has been so powerfully supported in my own career that I am almost willing to washout the factor of education as an intervening variable.

Training mothers to be early childhood aides has frequently forced me to re-examine my own values about college education as a universal prerequisite for teaching. While I still firmly believe in college degrees for all teachers, I now seriously question the appropriateness of college-age youth as our most desirable population. An examination of the research literature on cognitive abilities as well as the affective potentialities which are surely a direct correlative of life experience, leads to a simple conclusion. We prepare eighteen to twenty-two year-olds to become teachers because we have decided that the undergraduate experience is the "natural" place to gain aegis over large numbers of them. Now that we are more willing to consider quality factors, it is entirely reasonable to once again raise the question of graduate, post-graduate and delayed graduate education of teachers.

I recognize that members of this association do not have the power or the decision-making choice to force their essentially undergraduate institutions to totally revamp their student bodies. I would urge, however, based on (1) much evidence which supports high potential through middle years, (2) sound theory advocating the attainment of life experience as a relevancy base for subsequent learning, and (3) much testimony from teacher educators who have worked with adults, that we do not respond to the need to be more selective by merely chopping off the adults who do not fit into neat undergraduate sequences.

Section 3

COLLEGE INFLUENCE

Assuming we have drawn accurately on the highlights of human development and adult learning, we must now put the pieces together in light of what is known about the influence of university settings on particular kinds of students. Too often we have assumed that teacher education is offered in a vacuum. The sociological truth is that everything we do is filtered through the settings and larger influences created by the total university; and the psychological truth is that we have students who share some particular kinds of personal-professional orientations to what is offered them in these settings. What is the evidence on college impact? In what ways do college students change?

Feldman and Newcomb indicate that students who go through college increase their interest in aesthetic and cultural values, decrease their adherence to religion and other traditional values, become more relativistic and less moralistic in their ethical judgments. They also take an increasingly liberal rather than conservative position on political and socioeconomic issues and become more openminded as measured by scales on authoritarianism, dogmatism, ethnocentrism and prejudice (8). Chickering found the several areas of change in all colleges to include: increased autonomy, increased awareness of emotions and impulses and the increased readiness to express them, increased personal integration, increased aesthetic sensitivity and interest in the arts and humanities, increased tolerance for ambiguity and complexity, increased religious liberalism, and decreased concern for material possessions and practical achievement (4).

These patterns are directly related to length of attendance. While high school graduates who do not attend college tend to change somewhat in the same direction as college students, their changes are not as great. Students who drop out of college change more than high school graduates but less than college graduates. Impact seems directly related to the time spent in college (28). It is also important to note that while this liberalization reflects the impact of colleges generally, there are differential effects of different colleges and different programs within colleges.

As we will show later on, most students in teacher education are from lower socioeconomic and working class backgrounds. These students are more traditional than middle-class students when they begin as freshmen. It is noteworthy that the greatest change occurs in student groups that are originally lowest in libertarianism. The effect of college is to reduce the influence of prior social statuses and experiences and to forge a new set of shared identities and attitudes among college graduates (29).

The real question raised by researchers is whether these measured changes are real or superficial. Jacob interpreted the changes in college as merely reflecting an adaptation to a college norm which in turn reflects the societal norm, rather than the development of new internalized commitments to new values. He describes this impact as socializing

the individual to refine, polish, and shape up his values so he can fit into the ranks of American college alumni (15). Stated as a crude oversimplification of Jacob's view, all Americans are socialized to enjoy a hearty joke about "coons" or "polacks;" college graduates merely have sufficient practice at not laughing in public.

Supporting this view of no basic change are psychologists who conclude that the measured changes from freshman to senior are a process of superficial socialization not personality restructuring (18). In general, most psychologists view the whole process more as increased sophistication than as learning.

Recognizing the strengths in the argument of no significant change, most researchers and social scientists nevertheless support the importance of measured changes in college students. Gurin, who is an outstanding interpreter of this literature, states it this way:

> Lack of internalization cannot be equated with lack of significance, since all our values and attitudes are imbedded in cultural networks. That one does not find basic character restructuring and deep internalization of new values may not represent a failure of college as much as limitation on the nature of changes that are possible after the early formative years. Brim has suggested that it is very difficult to introduce in later life the conditions of early childhood that make value formation and internalization the natural processes of the early years (3). He suggests that postchildhood socialization involves different processes and effects. But this does not mean that the later processes and effects are not significant, persistent and critical to the orientation and life-styles an individual carries into adult life (14:54).

In effect Gurin and others are contending that while basic personality and values are not radically altered, college seems to change behavior in two ways: by accentuating predispositions and by pushing graduates into seeking new life orientations they would not have tried had they not been to college.

A summary of how the accentuation dynamic operates is offered by Feldman and Newcomb.

> Whatever the characteristics of an individual...going to college ...choosing a certain academic major, acquiring membership in a particular group of peers--those same characteristics are apt to be reinforced and extended by the experiences incurred in those selected settings (8:333).

In simplistic terms, whatever we are predisposed to become, the college experience accelerates, accentuates, and magnifies those predispositions. Even studies of student activism indicate that involvement and development of activist behavior is affected by the background characteristics and value orientations that a student brings with him to the college scene (17).

In addition to accentuation, college graduates have a second means for keeping their changes alive; they select environments which will reinforce their new directions. In his classic studies of Bennington coeds in the 1930's (24) and again in 1967, Newcomb's findings indicate that those girls who became less conservative in college tended to persist in those orientations (25). As women they were able to maintain their college changes by choosing a social milieu, including husbands, occupations and life activities, that supported and reinforced their new attitudes and values.

The debate about whether college changes are basic or superficial may be more academic than real. It is fairly clear that since college intensifies predispositions and influences the choice of subsequent life settings, it is operationally effective as a change process--assuming, of course, that we regard what people do as more important than what they say they do on tests of personality and values.

Regardless of the degree of impact that researchers attribute to college, they agree on the relative influence of settings. Change is greatest in the small, high-quality liberal arts colleges where there is consideral homogeneity of values and commitment to value development as an important aspect of the educational process.

There is more intensive faculty-student and student-student interaction in these semi-isolated residential communities. We know from the socialization literature that power relationships of high effect, such as respected teacher to involved student, can lead an individual to create significant others and cause him to change (3). The predominant framework has been to recognize value change as a process of taking on the values of faculty and peers, rather than as a process of intellectual integration of the information to which a student may be exposed while in college (30:237-54). Greater size and heterogeneity, more commuter settings, increased vocational rather than value commitments, all seem to lessen the general influences of college on students.

This brings us to the more specific concerns of teacher educators. Given the general impact of college on youth, are these influences the same for vocationally oriented students such as future teachers? In what ways does college exert a differential impact on students who view higher education as the means of entering a profession?

Characteristics of Vocationally Oriented College Students

Studies of students with vocational goals in college suggest that these students change less than other students. They seem to be less responsive to value and ideological issues not relevant to their vocational interests. Evidence indicates that they change less in political liberalism than other students (9). In changing vocational students there seem to be differential effects among school settings.

One well-conducted study indicated that at five Ivy-League schools, intellectually oriented and dedicated to civil rights, there was greater change between freshman and senior years than in five state colleges less dedicated to these goals (21). These data suggest that students

with strong vocational orientations may need an environment particularly involved in value issues to divert them from their strong vocational interests and make them susceptible to the environmental influences of the university setting. While the overall impact of college seems less on vocationally oriented students, there will be differential effects depending on the nature of the particular college.

An extensive body of research literature has accumulated which attempts to specifically describe college students as participating in a particular college subculture. Earlier analyses which labeled these subcultures as vocational, academic, collegiate and nonconformist (5) have been abandoned in recognition of the fact that students cannot be neatly pigeonholed as participating in only one college subculture. We now use methods of describing college groups which simultaneously coordinate several factors and give a more rounded description of students. In one study, 561 freshmen developed a student typology that helps distinguish between intellectual and academic orientations, and between those who regard the total college experience as vocational in contrast to those who have a specific vocation in mind and view college as an instrumentality (31:213-32). Since these two distinctions have direct relevance for selection into teacher education programs, I will elaborate on each.

The intellectually involved student is one whose major interests are in ideas and in aesthetic expression, who subordinates social status and the satisfaction of potential employer demands to the development of intellectual capabilities. He is seen by students as someone quite different from the academic student who is deeply involved in his classwork and who pursues it diligently with no question as to overall purposes. The key distinction between the academic and the intellectual orientations is that between an involvement with coursework and an involvement with ideas and aesthetics. The intellectual value set actually involves a negative orientation to classroom activities. Evidence suggests that most creative scholars were intellectually rather than academically oriented (20).

The academic orientation seems to be associated with utilitarianism, external direction and acceptance of goals established by others more than with the independence required for creative behavior. Disappointment of faculty members in the effectiveness of honors programs may be partly the result of unrealistic expectations that all students, whether academically or intellectually oriented, will respond uniformly. For example, designing a program for the intellectually oriented students and then selecting students on the basis of grades will recruit the more academically oriented ones.

Similarly, there is evidence that activism pulls students in opposite directions from vocationalism. To expect education students to be change agents and activists is to ignore the evidence (31). Students in the vocational subculture see college as preparation for an occupation and like the academically oriented, they do not question the purposes of college. Vocationally oriented students reject social protest or social change. The students themselves see the activists as the converse of the vocationally oriented.

Before concluding this section on how college influences various student subcultures it is important to note a general trend. Many of the former bastions of the liberal arts traditions are now actively pandering to the nonintellectual and vocational purposes for college which are generally held by the public (22). It goes without saying how the large public universities are responding.

If I had to choose the single most important trend in American higher education it would be this growing dominance of the view that all higher education "is" and "ought to be" vocational. Most people have always expected a college graduate to get a better paying job than a high school graduate--even if he majored in English literature. The difference today as compared with former decades seems to be that the colleges have given up resisting this value set and are even willing to be evaluated and held accountable by a student body and a public who hold primarily vocational purposes.

The fundamental finding of the Warren study, therefore, deals with what is called the "anomalous vocational student" (31). These students see little value in college either as general education or as preparation for a specific occupation. Yet, in a vague way they consider a degree important occupationally, a passport to a better but undefined job. They reject "collegiate" activities as expensive and trivial. College for these students is a hurdle to be surmounted in an uninteresting, weary struggle toward a higher place in the world. These students are not searching for self-understanding, or personal status, or aesthetic values and see little purpose in any of these dimensions. They think coursework might be useful in a job but are not sure how or what kind of job to which it might be applicable. They have a vague feeling college is good but no real conviction that it is. They are undirected and uncertain. The reason I have elaborated on this subculture is that I believe it is now a dominant group on many campuses and in many teacher education programs. Worse yet, ranks are about be be swelled by the "new" students of the 1970's and 1980's.

The New Students of the Seventies and Eighties

The newest group of college students are not black, brown, or red, but the white sons and daughters of blue-collar workers. The young people who did not attend college in the 1950's and '60's but who will enter college in increasing numbers in the 1970's and '80's are distinguished not by their color but by their past experience in lower income families and by failure in the American school system.

In the past, lack of academic abilities and low family income were the great barriers to college admission. By the late 1960's, college entrance had not only become commonplace for middle income students with above academic performance, but had opened up to new populations. Nearly three-quarters of those ranking in the upper academic half among high school graduates began entering college--even if they ranked in the lowest quarter on socioeconomic measures (7).

One of the persistent misunderstandings is that the most "remedial" students are members of minority groups. While it is true that blacks

and other minorities are over represented in this population, the family background of this population might be characterized as follows: two-thirds have blue-collar fathers who never attended college, more than half are white and female. The new students who will be coming include the one-third of the high school graduates who in previous decades did not continue any form of education beyond high school. (There is also a significant minority, about one-quarter of the lowest academic third, who may have had college educated parents but who experienced learning problems and school failure.) In general, it will be the poorer students academically and financially who will be coming.

The new students will have specific attitudes and values toward education which bear directly on their selection into teacher education programs. For example, they are more passive in learning situations; their learning problems have been diagnosed as "lack of effort, has quit trying" rather than poor background, poor schools or low intelligence (7).

In addition, on all types of leisure time activities, interest scales, hobbies, personality tests, new students express a preference for noncognitive activities. Most germane for teacher educators is the datum that describes these youngsters as more authoritarian. (See Omnibus Personality Inventory, Autonomy Scale.) Items such as "I am in favor of strict law enforcement no matter what."; "It is never right to disobey the government."; "More than anything else, hard work makes life worth while.", indicate that 58 percent of the new students, in comparison to 15 percent of the old students, hold the basic traditional values of American society.

Recalling the earlier section dealing with childhood learning and socialization processes, the knowledge that top-third and bottom-third students have significantly different school careers is more than incidental information. We know the gap between these groups widens in both relative and absolute terms as they proceed through the grades (6). Most students who graduate in the top third have been successful all the way through, while bottom-third students have had the opposite experience in double-barreled form: first, they were always lower-half students; second, they moved further down as they proceeded through.

The Educational Testing Service Growth Study (7) shows that for every 100 students who were in the top third as juniors in their high school class, 87 were in the top third in seventh grade, but for the 100 lowest-third high school juniors, only 52 were in the lowest third in seventh grade, 45 were in the middle third and moved down. We have a mountain of rational explanation to support this evidence. The successful obviously become achievement oriented and continue to do well; the lower achievers become fear threatened. By the time youngsters reach 18 years of age a self-rewarding cycle of success, academic involvement and activity, or, a cyle of failure, noncognitive pursuits and passivity has been well established.

One of the general things we can predict that will happen to these youngsters is they will be less welcome in the university. Few faculty were themselves former remedial students. In addition, university

curricula are organized to credit new achievements, not remedial ones. Most important, faculties are generally intolerant of the working class's value systems. It is a curious truism that "educated classes," e.g., faculty, find it difficult to understand the man who drives a beer truck or the fellow with a helmet working on a site across the street with plumbers and electricians, while their sensitivities race easily to Mississippi or even Bedford-Stuyvesant (26).

The implications of these trends for teacher education seem straightforward. Our entire system of higher education is moving toward increased access. We seem to have accepted the notion that equal opportunity means that everyone who chooses should have at least a chance to enter and to try some form of higher education. As this trend develops, I believe it will change our values in three phases. The right to open access or enrollment will become the right to self determined attendance or participation. This will ultimately be extended to mean the right to some form of universal, successful completion.

As teacher educators we are faced with the issue of how the general trend toward academic egalitarianism, e.g., access to higher education without regard to past achievement, should affect admission into programs of teacher education. Our history indicates that we have created a *structure* of selection criteria (See Tables, 1, 2, and 3), but that we have not chosen to actually function on these criteria.

In my own institution, 749 students were admitted to the school of education in 1970 and 24 were refused. Most of these 24 were subsequently admitted. In 1971, we admitted 929 students and denied 67 others. Twenty percent of those denied were subsequently admitted for showing "perseverance and commitment." The evidence of perseverance and commitment was that they chose to reapply while the others were naive enough to believe us when we turned them down the first time.

In effect, since we already have open access to teacher education, the new population which will be taking advantage of open access to the total university will build up an increasing pressure on the schools of education within these universities. This problem is intensified still further by the fact that teacher education admission inevitably leads to graduation and certification.

The implications of these trends for guidelines to be used in selection will be stated later but deserve some elaboration here. What makes this trend toward open university enrollment different from the past? As late as 1966, less than 14 percent of education seniors, white or black, north or south, had parents who were college graduates (6:365). We know that in past decades many of our teachers came from small-town, or rural working-class families; their only option was to attend the nearby teachers colleges or state colleges emphasizing teaching. We know, too, that while many of these students had basic life experiences, they were not necessarily very academic or scholarly. We know further that many of these students were not as "liberal" or "progressive" as the faculties they encountered in the universities; they were well-socialized in the traditional middle-class values. What then makes open enrollment for today's new students any different?

It seems to me there are some fundamental social class differences. Today's population of new students can be described as more culturally pluralistic; catholics as well as protestants; black and Chicano as well as white; big city as well as rural and small town; and quite clearly more experienced at school failure. But these student characteristics--as critical as they are--may not be as important as the changing role of public pressure on teacher education. During the 1930's there was no shortage of teachers yet teacher training colleges grew in response to the low-income-rural and small-town America.

Today, these general education needs can be met outside of teacher education programs in the all-purpose institutions which now exist within a few miles of almost everyone's home. Public pressure has shifted, not in response to the availability of jobs, but in response to the availability of general education facilities. Teacher education is now facing a fair, reasonable demand to retrench with a more accurate public charge to start behaving like professional education and to abandon its traditional but illogical role as the only available general education for small-town and rural folk.

The implication of this trend is quite clear. If we are serious about really selecting students for teacher education and if we see value in not merely responding to the total university policies regarding enrollment, we must act as if there are fundamental distinctions between general and professional education. Before we can act on these distinctions, however, we need to recognize what they are.

General education is that education which we want for all people. It is conceived in broad objectives such as basic skills and knowledge; thinking and problem solving; development of positive self-concept and individual potentialities; the ability to live in a culturally pluralistic, urban society; aesthetic development; health in its broad sense--environmental as well as personal; and a functional philosophy or set of values. Professional education can only regard these objectives as prerequisites to be gained in the total university setting. Once any teacher education program regards these general goals as *professional* objectives for teachers, then the only logical conclusion is the resurrection of teachers colleges where the full program of general studies is rationalized in terms of its usefulness for future teachers. Obviously, since teacher education is now irrevocably lodged in higher education, we are forced to assume the value of general education for all--including teachers--and to clarify the goals of professional education.

Section 4

SURVEY OF SELECTION CRITERIA

I recently conducted a survey of selection criteria through the offices of the Association of Teacher Educators (ATE). Three hundred and eighty-six institutions responded. I recognize this is not the total number of institutions which prepare teachers. Estimates vary, but I have seen numbers between 1,200 and 1,300 often enough to believe there are many more institutions involved in teacher education than are represented in ATE. But since there are approximately 464 institutions accredited by the National Council for Accreditation of Teacher Education (NCATE) (1971) and since ATE members are predominantly in NCATE approved institutions, I assumed two things: first, that the 386 who responded represent a sample of institutions which view teacher education as one of their regular institutional purposes and not merely as a few service courses to meet minimum state certification requirements on a course-by-course basis, and second, that since the 60 or 70 institutions which did not respond represent only about 15 percent of accredited institutions, they would not significantly change the generalizations drawn from these data.

TABLE 1 Criteria Used by 386 Colleges and Universities for Selecting Students into Teacher Education Programs.

Rank	Criteria	Frequency
1.	College grades	344
2.	English proficiency	238
3.	Speech proficiency	237
4.	Academic references	205
5.	Direct experiences with children/youth	172
6.	References	164
7.	Direct interview	161
8.	Physical examinations	158
9.	"Why I Want To Teach" statements	128
10.	Varied personality examinations/attitude tests	84
11.	High school grades	59
12.	Police record	31
13.	Loyalty oath	16

Table 1 indicates several clear patterns. (1) College grades are still the basic currency of admission to teacher education, particularly when academic references, which are heavily based on the same indices as grades, are added to this dimension. (2) Although institutions have given up swimming and music proficiencies, they are still committed to English and speech proficiencies. One institution still requires an auditory test; another retains piano proficiency as a general requirement.

(3) Less than half of the teacher education institutions regard direct experiences with children and youth as a selection factor. The commitment to direct experience is clearly one of using it for training and not self-selection by students, or as a basis of external judgments

by faculty. In fact, references, interviews and physical examinations are almost as widely used as direct experience with youngsters. The direct experiences which are utilized as screening vary from ten hours to one full year. I assume that the latter figure represents the point at which a student is technically admitted to a school of education more than it represents actual screening. It is also interesting to note that references actually refers to former teachers; less than five percent are of a general, religious, or work-experience nature.

(4) It is curious that in a profession, such as teaching, which prepares millions to administer tests, statements of "Why I want to teach," are used more frequently than written examinations of personality, attitudes, or values. If we take the position that these tests are inaccurate measures of real mental health, or teaching potential, how can we justify the use of grades which are clearly derived from nonstandardized measures, are more cognitively oriented and are more logically remote from work with children? The two obvious answers to this question are that a system of selection based on grades is cheaper and more efficient to operate on a wide-scale, and that there are fewer potential law suits using grades than personality tests. When one examines the actual tests reported in use, however, this issue becomes high-level rhetoric. The only test used as a selection device in as many as five institutions was the Minnesota Teacher Attitude Inventory, which in my judgment is simply a superficial attitude survey which can be correlated with anything but predictive of nothing. The wide range of tests emphasized school achievement, i.e., mathematics, spelling, writing, etc. more frequently than it examined personality or values. Less than ten institutions reported full-scale personality inventories as a selection procedure.

TABLE 2

Number of Criteria Used To Select Students Into Teacher Education Programs.

Number of Criteria	Number of Institutions
0	3
1	12
2	20
3	39
4	64
5	58
6	49
7	47
8	37
9	26
10	18
11	10
12	2
13	1
*Md. = 6 criteria	Total 386

Table 2 is a tabulation of the number of criteria used. The fact that the median number of criteria used by an institution is six, is less important then determining which of these criteria are absolute. I have no broadly based data here, but my experience suggests that grades are the usual criteria held as a minimum standard, while the others are more readily negotiable. In cases where the grade point average is "almost," "close," "not-quite," or extended into several decimals, they too, are easily bent.

TABLE 3

Changes Presently Being Considered for Selecting Students into Teacher Education.

Criteria	Number of Institutions	Percent
1. No changes comtemplated	265	68.7
2. Raise grade point requirements	30	7.7
3. More direct experiences	23	6.0
4. Psychological tests	10	2.6
5. Behavioral competency tests	10	2.6
6. English/speech proficiency	5	1.3
7. Faculty interview	4	1.0
8. Special course requirements	4	1.0
9. Lengthen student teaching	1	.3
10. Unclear expressions of intentions to improve selection practices	34	8.8
	386	100.0

Changes presently being considered by institutions are summarized in Table 3. The most obvious fact in this summary is that more than 68 percent or 265 institutions do not contemplate any changes in their present system of selection. Of those who plan to change, the criteria are of stock items, with grade point requirements once again heading the list. While 23 does not seem like many, it is the second most common change being contemplated. Perhaps once institutions do consider change, direct experiences will be used as a selection process. But this "perhaps" is a very small one given the static nature of Table 3 as a whole.

Section 5

GUIDELINES FOR SELECTION*

The following are principles which should undergird the process of selection. A reading of the evidence presented earlier, particularly in its original form, can easily lead to additional, perhaps even contradictory, recommendations. I will inevitably go beyond the data in stating what I believe "should be" basic considerations for teacher educators establishing selection procedures, but this is an inevitable extrapolation in order to engage in policy formulation, and I accept the responsibility.

1. *Admission to professional education is a professional decision not a student right*.

   All students have the right to general education. My personal view is that this should include four years of post secondary education or college. Such general studies should be evaluated in terms of how well they meet student needs and interests.

The opportunity to pursue professional education may be extended only on recommendation of professional experts. Students do not begin with the right to become teachers, thereby transferring the responsibility to disprove their potential to the profession. Quite the contrary, as the representatives of quality in its area of public service, the professional has the responsibility of justifying the admission of each student candidate. Each candidate has the responsibility of demonstrating that he possesses the potentials deemed requisite by these professional representatives.

The evidence indicates that the student and public perception which equates college with vocational education will intensify, thus continuing to bring large numbers to seek teacher education regardless of employment opportunities. The need for teacher education to invoke its selection prerogative is evident.

2. *Selection criteria derive from program goals and the capabilities needed by individuals to achieve those goals*.

   Every teacher education program needs precise goal statements in order to determine the knowledge, behaviors and values needed by its graduates. This clarity of vision regarding what the graduates will be able to do is the essence of selection since the research literature indicates that college can accentuate, amplify, and enhance students but not restructure personality or transform internalized social values. Students who are predisposed to achieve the program goals can only be selected if these goals have been made sufficiently clear.

---

*Author's note: This section is not a summary of preceeding sections.

3. *External selection must complement self-selection.*

Self-selection is a necessary but insufficient condition for determining admission. Ideally, procedures permit students varied direct experiences with children and youth upon which they can make suitable self-determinations. In practice, it is the professionals who must reconcile program goals with student predispositions and not simply accept that a student likes children. Research evidence as well as social science theory indicates that many applicants will have decided to be teachers on the basis of their childhood role perceptions, which for adults are dysfunctional but semipermanent.

4. *Professional experts involved in selection include more than college faculty.*

Recent graduates who now teach, experienced school practitioners, professionals in associations and government agencies--all have a responsibility to help determine entrance into the profession. College faculty who participate should also include others in addition to the education faculty who have traditionally exerted unilateral control over admission. The lack of interest of some teacher associations and some public schools in selection does not free them of this responsibility. Procedures for evaluating and alternating those who select should be clear, public information.

5. *College screening devices must be replaced by professional selection criteria.*

Grades, English and speech proficiencies, and academic references are inexpensive, efficient ways of screening large numbers of students. These criteria merely predict students' future success as students and do not predict teaching success. Real criteria grow out of clear program goals which have been translated into graduates' knowledge, behaviors and values. This knowledge of what the graduate should look like becomes the only legitimate basis for particular selection criteria.

Evidence is clear that the academically capable are not necessarily the intellectually, aesthetically, or social-problem oriented students. In addition, if program goals are supported by personality attributes such as activism, democratic values, or intellectual curiosity, then these characteristics must appear in the selection criteria--regardless of how much more inefficient they are to administer.

6. *Selection is a process not an event.*

Intensive periods of direct experience are the most appropriate bases for both self-selection and external judgments. As a rule, the total amount of direct experience with children and youth now offered in most teacher education programs is just about sufficient for selection purposes and not more than an initiation to actual training.

Evidence indicates that adult resocialization is a gradual process. Periods of direct experience for at least one year should be a minimum for self-selection and external judgments to be fair.

7. *Admission quotas are a function of faculty and clinical resources.*

Neither student demand nor the job market are suitable determinants of the number of students which should be admitted. The real educational potential of a particular teacher education program is a function of four factors: (1) its faculty resources, (2) the number of cooperating schools and teachers considered suitable as training partners, (3) its media supports, simulation materials and curriculum library and (4) the assumptions of the faculty regarding the nature of school staffing for which it is preparing practitioners. To respond to either student demand or to job opportunities ignores these four professional bases for actually determining program capability.

8. *Selection must assess the potential of candidates to function as continuous learners.*

The criteria developed must be more than assessments of static qualities which students have achieved in the past, even if these criteria are broadened to include lengthy direct experiences or personality tests. The uncertainties of professional practice demand that we have candidates as susceptible as possible to future growth. There is no other alternative when we neither expect nor desire schools and teachers to remain in fixed roles, performing rigid functions.

The evidence indicates that adult learning is characterized by behavior shifts rather than value shifts; by new syntheses rather than new insights; by increasing ability to deal with conflict, complexities and discrepancies; by the search for special ways to function and contribute; and by more realistic expectations for self and others. These are processes of becoming, not static qualities with minimum "satisfactory" amounts. There must be some selection criteria which attempt to assess candidates' potential use of these processes, if the profession has any intention of preparing practitioners who will grow subsequent to initial training.

9. *Selection must include procedures for screening adults as well as college youth.*

There is no basis for believing that effective future teachers must be selected as undergraduates. Evidence on adult learning and the extensive experience of teacher educators in programs with adults, indicates that it is necessary to provide processes which permit individuals who are not "typical" college youth to apply. Limiting selection to full-time undergraduates is an expedient way to cut down on applicants; it is clearly contrary to the best interests of the profession.

10. *More rigid adherence to existing criteria will not improve selection.*

Selection will not be improved by a more rigid enforcement of traditional criteria. Since the evidence is clear that what we now use to screen does not correlate with subsequent teaching, or logically connect with program goals, the advice to merely enforce what have always been the standards is ill-advised.

11. *All program changes made in the future should take account of their impact on selection.*

The proponents of fifth- or sixth-year programs, or new course-work, or revised direct experiences, must all be aware of how their program changes will effect external and self-selection. If, for example, a program change results in only low-income applicants self-selecting out, there may be a discriminatory element which is unhealthy for the total profession. Program changes must be defended as both quality and the opportunity to succeed without regard to ethnic background or social class.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

1. Botwinick, Jack. *Cognitive Processes in Maturity and Old Age.* New York: Springer Publishing Co., 1967. 212 pp.

2. Brim, Jr., Orville G. and others. *Personality and Decision-Making Processes: Studies in the Social Psychology of Thinking.* Stanford: Stanford University Press, 1962. 336 pp.

3. ___ and Wheeler, Stanton. *Socialization After Childhood: Two Essays.* New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1966. 116 pp.

4. Chickering, A. W. "College Experience and Student Development." Speech given at the 137th Annual Meeting of the American Association for the Advancement of Science, Chicago: 1970. (Mimeo.)

5. Clark, B. R. and Trow, M. "Determinants of College Student Subcultures." Center for the Study of Higher Education. Berkeley: University of California, 1960. (Mimeo.)

6. Coleman, James S. and others. *Equality of Educational Opportunity.* U.S. Department of Health, Education and Welfare, Office of Education. Washington, D.C.: Government Printing Office, 1966.

7. Cross, K. P. *Beyond the Open Door: New Students to Higher Education.* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1971. Data are from Project TALENT: SCOPE; the Comparative Guidance and Placement Program (CGP); and the Educational Testing Service Growth Study.

8. Feldman, Kenneth A. and Newcomb, Theodore M. *The Impact of College on Students.* (V.I,ch.2 and V.II. Tables 2A,2D,2E,2H, Higher Education Series.) San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1969.

9. Finney, H. C. "Development and Change of Political Liberatarianism Among Berkeley Undergraduates." Berkeley: University of California, 1967. (Unpublished doctoral dissertation.)

10. Garfield, S. and Blek, L. "Age, Vocabulary Level and Mental Impairment." *Journal of Consulting Psychology.* 16:395-398; 1962.

11. Goldstein, K. and Scheerer, M. "Abstract and Concrete Behavior." *Psychological Monograph.* 53:1-151; 1971.

12. Graybeal, William S. "Teacher Surplus and Teacher Shortage." *Phi Delta Kappan.* 53:82-85; October 1971.

13. ___. "Some Facts of Life for Teacher Educators." (Editorial) *Journal of Teacher Education.* 22:4:387-89; Winter 1971.

14. Gurin, G. "The Impact of the College Experience." in S. B. Withey, (ed.) *A Degree and What Else?* A report prepared for the Carnegie Corporation. New York: McGraw-Hill, 1971.

15. Jacob, Philip E. *Changing Values in College: An Exploratory Study of Impact of College Teaching*. New York: Harper and Row, 1957. 174 pp.

16. Jerome, E. A. "Decay of Heuristic Processes in the Aged." in Tibbitts, Clark and Donahue, William (eds.) *Social and Psychological Aspects of Aging*. pp. 802-803. New York: Columbia University Press, 1962.

17. Katz, Joseph. *No Time for Youth: Growth and Constraint in College*. San Franciso: Jossey-Bass, 1968.

18. Korn, K. A. "Personality Scales Changes from Freshman Year to the Senior Year." in Katz, J. (ed.). *No Time for Youth: Growth and Constraint in College*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968. 463 pp.

19. Lehman, Harvey C. *Age and Achievement*. Princeton, N.J.: Princeton University Press, 1953. 358 pp.

20. Mackinnon, D. W. "Identifying and Developing Creativity." *Selection and Educational Differentiation*. pp. 75-89. Center for the Study of Higher Education. Berkeley: University of California, 1959.

21. Miller, N. E. "Academic Climate and Student Values." Paper presented at the 54th Annual Meeting of the American Sociological Association, Chicago, 1959. (Mimeo.)

22. *Milwaukee Journal*. Ripon College Advertisement. TV Section. February 13, 1972. p. 9. The ad for Ripon's three-year liberal arts program gives the following reasons for applying: (1) Save $4,000 on your education. (2) Gain as much as $8,000 through an added year of employment. (3) Enter graduate school a year early. (4) Free a whole year of prime time in your life for travel, outside study, or employment. (5) Pursue a challenging academic program, free of boredom and incidentals.

23. Neugarten, B. "Personality Changes During the Adult Years." in Kuhlen, Raymond G., (ed.), *Psychological Backgrounds of Adult Education*. Papers presented at a Syracuse University Conference, Sagamore, N.Y., October 1962.

24. Newcomb, Theodore M. *Personality and Social Change: Attitude Formation in a Student Community*. A Study sponsored by the American Council on Public Affairs. New York: Dryden Press, 1943. 225 pp.

25. ___ and others. *Persistence and Change: Bennington College and Its Students After Twenty-five Years*. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1967. 292 pp.

25. Novak, Michael. "White Ethnic." *Harper's Magazine*. 243:44-50; September 1971.

27. Parsons, Talcott. "Family Structure and the Socialization of the Child." in Parsons, T. and others. (eds.), *Family, Socialization and Interaction Process*. Glencoe, Ill.: The Free Press, 1955. 422 pp.

28. Trent, James W. and Medsker, L. L. *Beyond High School: A Psychological Study of 10,000 High School Graduates*. California University Center for Research and Development in Higher Education Publications. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 1968. 333 pp.

29. Trow, M. "Education and Survey Research," in Glock, Charles Y. (ed.), *Survey Research in the Social Sciences*, with contributions by John W. Bennett and others. New York: Russell Sage Foundations, 1967. 543 pp.

30. Vreeland, R. S. and Bidwell, C. E. "Classifying University Departments: An Approach to the Analysis of Their Effects Upon Undergraduates' Values and Attitudes," *Sociology of Education*. 39: 3; Summer 1966.

31. Warren, J. B. "Student Perceptions of College Subcultures." *American Educational Research Journal*. 5: 2; March 1968.

32. Wechsler, D. *Scoring Manual Adult Intelligence*. New York: Psychological Corporation, 1955.

33. Welford, A. T. *Aging and Human Skill*. London: Oxford University Press, 1958.

ATE PUBLICATIONS LIST & ORDER BLANK

QUANTITY

YEARBOOKS

_____ 1968 Internships in Teacher Education $4.75 (860-24468)
_____ 1967 Mental Health and Teacher Education $4.75 (860-24420)
_____ 1966 Professional Growth Inservice of the Supervising Teacher $4.75 (860-24418)
_____ 1965 Theoretical Bases for Professional Laboratory Experiences in Teacher Education $3.50 (860-24416)
_____ 1956 Four Went To Teach $2.00 (860-24402)

COMMISSION PUBLICATIONS

_____ Position Paper 1 The Supervising Teacher: Standards for Selection and Function (1966) $1.00 (861-24456)
_____ The Study of Teaching, Corrigan, editor (1967) $1.50 (861-24458)
_____ Position Paper 2 The College Supervisor: Standards for Selection and Function (1968) $1.00 (861-24464)
_____ An Approach to the Analysis of Clinical Settings for Teacher Education, McIntosh, Third Florence B. Stratemeyer Lecture (1968) $.50 (861-24490)
_____ Ferment in Professional Education of Teachers, Fourth Florence B. Stratemeyer Lecture (1969) $1.00 (861-24478)
_____ A Guide to Professional Excellence in Clinical Experiences in Teacher Education (1970) $1.50 (861-24488)
_____ Teacher Education: Future Directions, Report of 1970 Conference Presentations, Lindsey, editor (1970) $4.00 (861-24492)
_____ Performance-Based Certification of School Personnel (1971) $1.75 (861-24494)
_____ New Directions in Certification, Andrews, (1972) $1.50 (861-24496)

RESEARCH BULLETINS

_____ 6 Studying Role Relationships, Corrigan & Garland (1966) $1.00 (868-24454)
_____ 7 The Director of Student Teaching: Characteristics and Reponsibilities, Griffith & Martin (1968) $1.50 (868-24460)
_____ 8 Simulation as an Instructional Alternative in Teacher Preparation, Cruickshank, (1971) $1.25 (868-24462)
_____ 9 Microteaching: Selected Papers, Cooper and Allen, Schuck (1971) $1.50 (868-24464)
_____ 10 Interaction Analysis: Selected Papers, Furst, Sandefur and Bressler, Johnston (1971) $1.50 (868-24466)
_____ 11 Guidelines for the Selection of Students into Programs of Teacher Education, Haberman (1972) $1.50 (868-24468)

BULLETINS

_____ 1 Guiding Student Teaching Experiences, Hilliard & Durrance (1968) $1.00 (867-24466)
_____ 21 The Student Teacher's Experiences in the Community, Blair & Erickson (1964) $1.00 (867-24440)
_____ 27 The Student Teacher and Professional Activities, Loftis (1966) $1.00 (867-24450)
_____ 28 Supervisory Conference as Individualized Teaching, Bebb, Low, & Waterman (1969) $1.25 (867-24480)
_____ 29 Teaching is Communicating: Nonverbal Language in the Classroom, Galloway (1970) $1.00 (867-24482)
_____ 30 The Teaching Clinic: A Team Approach to the Improvement of Teaching, Olsen, Barbour, & Michalak (1971) $1.25 (867-24484)

ANNOTATED BIBLIOGRAPHIES

_____ An Annotated Bibliography on the Professional Education of Teachers (1968) $1.00 (861-24462)
_____ An Annotated Bibliography on the Professional Education of Teachers (1969) $1.75 (861-24476) Print and non-print materials included.

ATE REPRINT SERIES

_____ No. 1 The Professional Development of the Student of Teaching, Heidelbach, editor (1970) $.50 (865-24484)
_____ No. 2 College-School-Community Partnerships, McGeoch, editor (1970) $.50 (865-24486)

HOW TO ORDER ATE PUBLICATIONS

QUANTITY DISCOUNTS: 5 or more copies of a title, 10 percent.
PAYMENT: All orders must be prepaid except for those on official purchase order forms. Shipping and handling charges will be added to billed orders. Make all checks or money orders payable to the ATE.

☐ Information about ATE

Name_____

Street_____

City, State and Zip Code_____

Please return order form to:
ASSOCIATION OF TEACHER EDUCATORS
1201 Sixteenth Street, N.W., Washington, D.C. 20036

ABOUT ERIC

The Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) forms a nationwide information system established by the U.S. Office of Education, designed to serve and advance American education. Its basic objective is to provide ideas and information on significant current documents (e.g., research reports, articles, theoretical papers, program descriptions, published and unpublished conference papers, newsletters, and curriculum guides or studies) and to publicize the availability of such documents. Central ERIC is the term given to the function of the U.S. Office of Education, which provides policy, coordination, training, funds, and general services to the 19 clearinghouses in the information system. Each clearinghouse focuses its activities on a separate subject-matter area; acquires, evaluates, abstracts, and indexes documents; processes many significant documents into the ERIC system; and publicizes available ideas and information to the education community through its own publications, those of Central ERIC, and other educational media.

TEACHER EDUCATION AND ERIC

The ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education, established June 20, 1968, is sponsored by three professional groups--the American Association of Colleges for Teacher Education (fiscal agent); the Association of Teacher Educators, a national affiliate of the National Education Association; and the Division of Instruction and Professional Development, National Education Association. It is located at One Dupont Circle, Washington, D.C. 20036.

SCOPE OF CLEARINGHOUSE ACTIVITIES

Users of this guide are encouraged to send to the ERIC Clearinghouse on Teacher Education documents related to its scope, a statement of which follows:

> *The Clearinghouse is responsible for research reports, curriculum descriptions, theoretical papers, addresses, and other materials relative to the preparation of school personnel (nursery, elementary, secondary, and supporting school personnel); the preparation and development of teacher educators; and the profession of teaching. The scope includes the preparation and continuing development of all instructional personnel, their functions and roles. While the major interest of the Clearinghouse is professional preparation and practice in America, it also is interested in international aspects of the field.*

The scope also guides the Clearinghouse's Advisory and Policy Council and staff in decision-making relative to the commissioning of monographs, bibliographies, and directories. The scope is a flexible guide in the idea and information needs of those concerned with pre- and inservice preparation of school personnel and the profession of teaching.